



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/826,908

04/19/2004

Kazuei Yoshioka

252008US2

1758

22850 7590 01/11/2007

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KUMAR, KALYANAVENKA K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3653

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
----------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

01/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/826,908	Applicant(s) YOSHIOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kalyan Kumar	Art Unit 3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1015-2004 and 4-19-2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first action on the merits of application 10/826908.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Izawa et al (USP 6,264,556 B1)**. Regarding claim 1, Izawa discloses a money validation machine comprising a money validation unit (12), a detachable money storage unit (110), wherein the money validation unit is electrically connected to the detachable money storage unit and supplies both electric power and a money information signal (col. 5, lines 52-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izawa in view of **Blad et al (US Pub 2002/0063035 A1)**. Regarding claim 2, Izawa discloses all the limitations of the claim except a money validation unit and a money storage unit having two connection terminals. Blad teaches a money validation unit and a money storage unit having two connection terminals for the purpose of a wide tolerance being available for inserting a money storage unit into a money validation machine still maintaining a reliable electrical connection between the terminals (paragraph 0048, lines 16-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa's money validation machine to have two connection terminals on the money validation and storage units, as taught by Blad, for the purpose of a wide tolerance being available for inserting a money storage unit into a money validation machine still maintaining a reliable electrical connection between the terminals.

Regarding claim 3 and 7, Izawa discloses all the limitations of the claims, including a validation side communication control unit, a validation side receiving unit (col. 3, lines 59-61), a storage side receiving unit, a storage side communication control (col. 5, lines 52-55) and a current lead-in unit (136). Izawa does not disclose a storage side power supply unit and a validation side power supply unit. Blad teaches a storage side power supply unit (102) and a validation side power supply unit (128) for the purpose of preserving memory contents even when the chip is removed from a power source for extended periods of time (paragraph 0045, lines 25-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 3653

was made to modify Izawa's money validation machine to have a validation side power supply unit and a storage side power supply unit, as taught by Blad, for the purpose of preserving memory contents even when the chip is removed from a power source for extended periods of time.

Regarding claim 16, Izawa discloses all the limitations of the claim, but Izawa does not disclose a money storage unit that is able to be connected to a collection device other than the money validation unit. Blad further teaches the money storage unit is able to be connected to a collection device other than the money validation unit for the purpose of being connected to a mobile cart so that money storage units may be systematically removed from successive gaming machines (paragraph 0056, lines 21-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa's money validation machine to be able to be connected to other collection devices, as taught by Blad, for the purpose of being connected to a mobile cart so that money storage units may be systematically removed from successive gaming machines.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izawa in view of Blad (Izawa/Blad) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of **Bryant et al (USP 6,513,639 B1)**. Regarding claim 4, Izawa/Blad disclose all the limitations of the claim, but Izawa/Blad does not disclose a power supply unit comprising a first diode, a capacitor, a second diode, and a three-terminal regulator. Bryant teaches power supply unit comprising a first diode (46), a capacitor (22), a second diode (22), and a three-terminal regulator (54) for the purpose of converting AC to DC voltage (col. 4, line 1).

Art Unit: 3653

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa/Blad's power supply unit, as taught by Bryant, for the purpose of converting AC to DC voltage.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izawa/Blad as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of **Lamah (USP 5,788,046)**. Regarding claim 5, Izawa/Blad discloses all the limitations of the claim, but Izawa/Blad does not disclose a photo-coupler having an LED, a phototransistor, and an impedance element. Lamah teaches a photo-coupler having an LED (204a-e), a phototransistor (205a-e), and an impedance element (431-435) for the purpose of permitting coins of any currencies to be recognized (col. 1, lines 50-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa/Blad's money validation machine with a photo-coupler having an LED, a phototransistor, and an impedance element, as taught by Lamah, for the purpose of permitting coins of any currencies to be recognized.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izawa/Blad as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of **Cassidy et al (USP 5,615,625)**. Regarding claim 6, Izawa/Blad discloses all the limitations of the claim, including a lid with a lid lock/unlock unit (170 and 172). Izawa/Blad does not disclose a lid lock/unlock unit using electric power and controlled to lock and unlock. Cassidy teaches a lid lock/unlock unit using electric power and controlled to lock and unlock for the purpose of added security (col. 4, lines 9-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 3653

modify Izawa/Blad's money validation machine to include an electronic lock, as taught by Cassidy, for the purpose of added security.

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izawa/Blad as applied to claims 3 and 7 above, and further in view of **Handelman et al (US Pub 2002/0048067 A1)**. Regarding claims 8-13, Izawa/Blad discloses all the limitations of the claims, but Izawa/Blad does not disclose storage side and validation side encoding and decoding of a signal from RZ code format to NRZ code format and storage side and validation side encoding and decoding of a signal from NRZ code format to RZ code format. Handelman teaches storage side and validation side encoding and decoding of a signal from RZ code format to NRZ code format and storage side and validation side encoding and decoding of a signal from NRZ code format to RZ code format (paragraph 0172) for the purpose of converting RZ signal samples into NRZ signal samples (paragraph 0175, lines 4-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa/Blad's money validation machine to include storage side and validation side encoding and decoding, as taught by Handelman, for the purpose of converting RZ signal samples into NRZ signal samples.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izawa/Blad as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of **Battrick (USP 3,806,651)**. Regarding claims 14 and 15, Izawa/Blad disclose all the limitations of the claims but, Izawa/Blad does not disclose the money storage unit including a power polarity normalization unit comprising a diode bridge. Battrick discloses a power polarity

Art Unit: 3653

normalization unit comprising a diode bridge for the purpose of insuring the same voltage polarity is always applied to the electronic circuitry of the coin signaling circuit (col. 3, lines 64-68 and col. 4, lines 1-2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Izawa/Blad's money storage unit with a power polarity normalization unit, as taught by Battrick, for the purpose of insuring the same voltage polarity is always applied to the electronic circuitry of the coin signaling circuit.

Claims 9, 10, 12, and 13 appear to be written to invoke 35 USC 112 6th paragraph. However, the applicant has not formally invoked 35 USC 112 6th paragraph. Therefore, the examiner has construed the claims as not invoking 35 USC 112 6th paragraph. If the applicant wishes to invoke 35 USC 112 6th paragraph, please make a formal statement and identify the corresponding structure in the specification for each means plus function recitation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan Kumar whose telephone number is 571-272-8102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on 571-272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kalyan Kumar
Examiner
Art Unit 3653



PATRICK MACKEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600